

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-9, 11, 13-16 and 40-53 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 9 being the independent claims. Claims 1 and 9 are sought to be amended. Support for these amendment can be found, for example, at paragraphs 44-50 of the as filed specification. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Statement of Substance of Interview***

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.133, Applicants provide the following statement of substance of the interview. Applicants expresses their appreciation to Examiner Hance for the courtesy of a personal interview with Applicants' representatives on April 15, 2010. During the interview, Applicants' representatives and the Examiner discussed clarifying amendments to claim 1 to further distinguish over the art of record.

An agreement was reached. In particular, Applicants' representatives agreed to amend claim 1 to recite "a controller configured to receive the request for the action be performed at one of the distributed electronic devices and to generate management instructions to adjust the distributed electronic devices responsive to the action to be performed at the one of the distributed electronic devices and the device information" to overcome the references of record. Applicants' representative further agreed to amend claim 9 to recite a similar distinguishing feature to overcome the references of record.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

**Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 16, 40, 42-48, 50, and 51**

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 16, 40, 42-48, 50, and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2004/0148632 to Park et al. (“Park”) in view of U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0026528 to Lo (“Lo”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,784,805 to Harris et al.

Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection and solely to expedite prosecution, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite features that distinguish over the applied references. In particular, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite “a controller configured to receive the request for the action be performed at one of the distributed electronic devices and to generate management instructions to adjust the distributed electronic devices responsive to the action to be performed at the one of the distributed electronic devices and the device information.” As agreed during the personal interview between Applicants’ representatives and the Examiner, the combination of Park, Lo, and Harris does not teach or suggest at least this feature.

Because the combination of Park, Lo, and Harris does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 1, they cannot render that claim unpatentable. Dependent claims 2-4, 6-8, 46-48, 50, and 51 are similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Park, Lo, and Harris for the same reason as independent claim 1, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-8, 46-48, 50, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claim 9 recites, among other features, “generating management instructions to adjust the distributed electronic devices in response to the action to be

performed at the one of the electronic devices and the device information.” As noted above, in regard to claim 1, the combination of Park, Lo, and Harris does not teach or suggest at least this feature. Therefore, the combination of Park, Lo, and Harris cannot render independent claim 9 unpatentable. Dependent claims 11, 16, 40, and 42-45 are similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Park, Lo, and Harris for at the same reasons as independent claim 9, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 9, 11, 16, 40, and 42-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claims 5 and 13-15**

Claims 5 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Park in view of Lo in view of Harris and further in view of U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2005/0117052 to Willes et al. (“Willes”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Willes does not cure the deficiencies of Park, Lo, and Harris with respect to independent claims 1 and 9, as noted above. Dependent claims 5 and 13-15 are similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Park, Lo, Harris, and Willes for the same reason as claims 1 and 9, from which they respectively depend, and further in view of their own features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 5 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claims 41 and 49**

Claims 41 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Park in view of Lo in view of Harris and further in view of U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2003/0227439 to Lee et al. (“Lee”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Lee does not cure the deficiencies of Park, Lo, and Harris with respect to independent claims 1 and 9, as noted above. Dependent claims 41 and 49 are similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Park, Lo, Harris, and Lee for the same reason as claims 1 and 9, from which they respectively depend, and further in view of their own features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 41 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claims 52 and 53**

Claims 52 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Park in view of Lo in view of Harris and further in view of U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2003/0007001 to Zimmerman (“Zimmerman”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Zimmerman does not cure the deficiencies of Park, Lo, and Harris with respect to independent claims 1 and 9, as noted above. Dependent claims 52 and 53 are similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Park, Lo, Harris, and Zimmerman for the same reason as claims 1 and 9, from which they respectively depend, and further in view of their own features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 52 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.


***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

  
Robert Sokohl  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 36,013

Date: 6/15/10

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

1094800\_1.DOC